

Appl. No. 10/626,182
Amdt. dated 08/08/2006
Reply to Office Action of 07/20/2006

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3 – 8, 10 – 15 and 17 – 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over P. J. Fleming and J.J. Parker IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, vol. 33, issue 9, Feb 1991 (Fleming here after) in view of Jun Hasegawa et al. (Japanese patent no. JP 61136145) and document NA910962 (Variable length Use Specified Page Fault, IBM Technical Bulletin, Sept. 1991 and Applicant's admitted prior art. Claims 4 – 7, 11 – 14 and 17 – 21 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and to overcome the 112 rejection made thereto.

Applicants have amended Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 to delete the limitations that the Examiner found offensive as well as to better claim the invention. Thus, Applicants believe that the 112 rejection is overcome.

Applicants have also amended Claims 1, 8 and 15 to include the limitations of Claims 3 and 4, Claims 10 and 11 and Claims 17 and 18, respectively, to capture the claims the Examiner indicates as being allowable. Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 17 and 18 are canceled. Consequently Claims 1, 5 – 7, 8, 12 – 14, 15 and 19 – 21 remain pending in the Application.

Respectfully Submitted

By: 

Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969

AUS920030464US1

Page 7 of 7